

Application No. 10/705,570  
Amendment dated October 24, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2006

Docket No.: MN-24,954-122CIP

**REMARKS:**

I. General

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. The issues in the Office Action mailed September 12, 2006 are as follows:

- Claims 1-13, 15-17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Besel.
- Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel in view of Marcussen et al.
- Claims 14, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel in view of Miner et al.

Applicant hereby traverses the outstanding rejections and objections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal in light of the remarks and amendments contained herein.

II. Claims 1-13, 15-17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Besel.

**Claims 1, 5, 15, :** Independent claims 1, 5, and 15 has been amended to clarify applicant's invention wherein the steps of wetting a portion of a cleaning medium, and then extracting that portion prior to wiping the surface to be cleaned with that portion.

In comparison, Besel et al teaches wetting a portion of revolving belt 134 (the portion being that part of belt 134 receiving cleaning liquid from nozzle 82N), then wiping the portion of the wetted belt against the surface, and then extracting the soiled solution from the portion of the belt 134. See, Fig. 6. As Besel et al. does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 wherein the ordered wetting, then extracting, and then wiping are repeated during a cleaning procedure, reconsideration of the rejection under 102(b) is requested.

Application No. 10/705,570  
Amendment dated October 24, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2006

Docket No.: MN-24,954-122CIP

III. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel in view of Marcussen et al.

It is submitted that the combination of Besel and Marcussen et al, even if proper, would fail to yield all limitations of the present invention. In particular, neither Besel nor Marcussen et al. teaches or suggests the steps of spraying a portion of a revolving cleaning medium, then removing some soil and some of the cleaning liquid from the wetted portion of the cleaning medium, and then wiping the carpeted surface with the portion of the cleaning medium. Neither Besel nor Marcussen et al. teaches or suggests spraying cleaning liquid on a portion of a revolving cleaning medium and then removing some soil and some cleaning liquid from the portion of the cleaning medium prior to wiping the portion on a carpeted surface.

IV. Claims 14, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel in view of Miner et al.

It is submitted that the combination of Besel and Miner et al, even if proper, would fail to yield all limitations of the present invention. In particular, neither Besel nor Miner et al. teaches or suggests the steps of spraying a portion of a revolving cleaning medium, then removing some soil and some of the cleaning liquid from the wetted portion of the cleaning medium, and then wiping the carpeted surface with the portion of the cleaning medium. Neither Besel nor Miner et al. teaches or suggests spraying cleaning liquid on a portion of a revolving cleaning medium and then removing some soil and some cleaning liquid from the portion of the cleaning medium prior to wiping the portion on a carpeted surface.

Application No. 10/705,570  
Amendment dated October 24, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2006

Docket No.: MN-24,954-122CIP

**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

October 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By John F. Klos  
John F. Klos  
Registration No.: 37,162  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P  
2100 IDS Center  
80 South Eighth Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2112  
(612) 321-2806  
(612) 321-2288 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant